

that such a petition has been inadvertently overlooked and is required. As provided below, charge Deposit Account **04-1105** for any required fee.

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1- 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9-13, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,402,143 to Ge, et al. ("Ge" or the "Ge Reference") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,222,512 to Tajima, et al. (Tajima" or the "Tajima Reference"); claims 2-4, 14-20, 22, 25, 27, and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,572,341 to Fergason ("Fergason" or the "Fergason Reference"); claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,760,858 to Hodson, et al. ("Hodson" or the "Hodson Reference"); claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Fergason and Hodson; claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,535,027 to Kimura, et al. ("Kimura" or the "Kimura Reference"); and claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Fergason and Kimura. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments and for reasons detailed below.

Claims 1, 9-13, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29

The Examiner admits that Ge "lacks the light output layers shining when a specified time has elapsed after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted to the scan/gate line electrode and extinguishing before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line are transmitted", asserting, however, that, the Tajima reference teaches the element and, therefore, makes the invention as claimed obvious. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that, Tajima teaches that, no light from the ELD is transmitted until every scan line, i.e., G1 to Gn, has been scanned and received its signal.

Claims 1, 11, and 13 require that, one or more light output layers shine "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and that the same one or more light output layers extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted." In other words, none of the light output layers are ON or OFF, respectively, until or before a "complete set of data signals" is transmitted. The Tajima reference does not teach, mention or suggest such a recitation.

Indeed, referring to FIG. 8, Tajima shows that, light output layers are turned ON and OFF multiple times in each sub-frame SF-1 to SF-6 of the frame. Accordingly, Tajima teaches away from one or more light output layers shine "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and that the same one or more light output layers extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted."

Moreover, referring again to FIG. 8 and comparing it with FIG. 5 of the present invention, Tajima merely shows the waveforms for a single gate line, say G1. There are no other gate lines shown (say G2-G4). Therefore, there is no teaching that any light output layer shines "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and/or extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted." As FIG. 10 shows, Tajima is merely demonstrating how

different gray levels (64 in number) are achieved by varying whether the sub-frames are ON or OFF in each frame.

With respect to claims 26, 28, and 29, there is nothing in either reference that teaches, mentions or suggests that, the light output layer is adjusted in terms of luminance to a maximum luminance of the data signals for each scan line. Indeed, the Examiner has not and cannot cite to any portion of either reference where this feature of the invention is taught, mentioned or suggested.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 1, 9-13, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29 are not made obvious by Ge in view of Tajima and, further, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claims 1, 9-13, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, and 29 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claims 2-4, 14-20, 22, 25, 27, and 30

Similarly, claims 2 and 14 also require that, one or more light output layers shine "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and that the same one or more light output layers extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted." In other words, none of the light output layers are ON or OFF, respectively, until or before a "complete set of data signals" is transmitted. As above, the Tajima reference does not teach, mention or suggest such a recitation.

Here again, referring to FIG. 8, Tajima shows that, light output layers are turned ON and OFF multiple times in each sub-frame SF-1 to SF-6 of the frame. Accordingly, Tajima teaches away from one or more light output layers shine "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and that the same one or more light output layers extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted."

Moreover, referring again to FIG. 8 and comparing it with FIG. 5 of the present invention, Tajima merely shows the waveforms for a single gate line, say G1. There are no other gate lines shown (say G2-G4). Therefore, there is no teaching that any light output layer shines "after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted" and/or extinguishes "before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted." As FIG. 10 shows, Tajima is merely demonstrating how different gray levels (64 in number) are achieved by varying whether the sub-frames are ON or OFF in each frame.

Nor can the Fergason reference make up for the deficiencies of the Ge and Tajima references. Indeed, the Fergason reference does not teach, mention or suggest controlling light output layers to shine after a complete set of scanning signals and extinguish before the next complete set of scanning signals.

With respect to claims 27 and 30, there is nothing in either reference that teaches, mentions or suggests that, the light output layer is adjusted in terms of luminance to a maximum luminance of the data signals for each scan line. Indeed, the Examiner has not and cannot cite to any portion of either reference where this feature of the invention is taught, mentioned or suggested.

Accordingly, claims 2-4, 14-20, 22, 25, 27, and 30 are not made obvious by Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Fergason and, further, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that the claims and all claims depending therefrom are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 5

For the same reasons provided above that the Ge and Tajima references do not make obvious claim 2 of the present invention, the Ge and Tajima reference also do not make claim 5 obvious. Nor can the Hodson reference make up for the deficiencies

of the Ge and Tajima references. Indeed, the Hodson reference does not teach, mention or suggest controlling light output layers to shine after a complete set of scanning signals and extinguish before the next complete set of scanning signals. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 5 is not made obvious by Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Hodson and, further, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 5 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 6

For the same reasons provided above that the Ge, Tajima, and Fergason references do not make obvious claim 2 of the present invention, Ge, Tajima, and Fergason, further in view of Hodson do not make claim 6 obvious. Nor can the Hodson reference make up for the deficiencies of the Ge, Tajima, and Fergason references. Indeed, the Hodson reference does not teach, mention or suggest controlling light output layers to shine after a complete set of scanning signals and extinguish before the next complete set of scanning signals. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 6 is not made obvious by Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Fergason and further in view of Hodson and, further, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 6 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 7

Nor can the Kimura reference make up for the deficiencies of the Ge and Tajima references. Kimura discloses a display device having a plurality of luminous sources arrayed in parallel with each other, a plurality of linear electrodes arrayed with each other, wherein the luminous sources are crossed with the linear electrodes, and a plurality of photoconductive layers provided at these crossed positions. See, e.g.,

Kimura, Abstract. Kimura, however, does not teach, mention or suggest controlling light output layers to shine after a complete set of scanning signals and extinguish before the next complete set of scanning signals. Accordingly, the combination of Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Kimura does not teach, mention or suggest the present invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 7 is not made obvious by Ge in view of Tajima, further in view of Kimura and, further, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 7 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 8

Nor can the Kimura reference make up for the deficiencies of the Ge, Tajima, and Fergason references. Indeed, the Kimura reference does not teach, mention or suggest controlling light output layers to shine after a complete set of scanning signals and extinguish before the next complete set of scanning signals.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 8 is not made obvious by Ge in view Tajima, further in view of Fergason and further in view of Kimura and, moreover, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 8 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

M. Koden, et al.
USSN: 09/937,796
Page 8

The Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason the fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 23, 2004

By: 
George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicants

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 517-5523
Customer No. 21874
454390